



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/685,234 | 10/14/2003 | Bin Zhu | MSI-1753US | 4625 |
| 22801 | 7590 | 06/29/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201 | | | HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E | |
| | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | 2134 | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/29/2007 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/685,234 | ZHU ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Matthew Heneghan | Art Unit 2134 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Matthew Heneghan. (3) _____.

(2) Kasey Christie. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 June 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Proposed declaration from Inventor (BIN) explaining specification changes.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney Christie and the Examiner reviewed a proposed declaration designed to overcome new matter issues. The Examiner stated that the declaration would be insufficient.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required